

# CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT NO. 2 CHATHAM-SQUARE, BY P. PRICE, AT \$2 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

VOL. II.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 9, 1833.

NO. 19.

FROM THE EXPOSITOR.

## SCRIPTURE EXPLANATION.

*Explanation of Matt. x, 14, 15, and parallel texts.*

'And whosoever shall not receive you nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city.'

Matt. x, 14, 15.

Considering the doctrines which have prevailed in christendom, it is by no means surprising that this text has been commonly understood to refer to a day of judgment in the immortal world. The future tense of the verb, *shall be*, seems to favor such an application, when considered in connexion with some of the most striking circumstances of the subject. When our Savior spoke these words, Sodom and Gomorrah had for ages ceased to exist in this world; and still he said, 'it shall be more tolerable for' them in the day of judgment, than for the cities which should not receive his disciples, nor hear their words. Accordingly, it is contended, the judgment here mentioned must be in the future world, where alone Sodom and Gomorrah, long since perished, could then be arraigned. Such has been the almost unanimous conclusion of those who already admitted the doctrine itself, especially among the common class of readers.

But general as this consent has been, some of their most judicious commentators and some of their best critics in the original languages, have been convinced, against their prejudices, that the text ought to be applied otherwise. This will appear from the quotations which we are about to adduce from Dr. Hammond, Bishop Pearce, Dr. Seiler, Gilbert Wakefield, and Dr. A. Clarke. Dr. Hammond was of the church of England; and though his works are now superseded in a great measure by others, they still hold a rank among standard authorities. Bishop Pearce, also, of that church, was perhaps the soundest critic it has produced. He was the intimate friend of Sir Isaac Newton, and one of the first scholars of his age in ancient literature, profane as well as sacred. Dr. Seiler was a standard German critic, and author of a commentary on the New Testament. Gilbert Wakefield was an English Unitarian, celebrated for his extensive knowledge of the Greek language, and well known by his translation of the New Testament. Dr. A. Clarke, lately deceased, was in point of Biblical literature, the most eminent writer of which the Methodist church could ever boast. We now lay before the reader their exposition of the latter part of the text.

Dr. HAMMOND expresses its meaning in the following paraphrase: 'I assure you, the punishment or destruction that will light upon that city, shall be such that the destruction of Sodom will appear to be more tolerable than that.' He then refers to what he had said in another place on the phrase, *kingdom of God*, where he thus quoted and explained the text: 'Verily, I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom in that day (i. e. not in the day of judgment to come, for that belongs to each particular person, not whole cities together, but) in that day of the kingdom of God, than for that refractory city. God's dealing with Sodom in the day of their destruction with fire and brimstone, shall be acknowledged to have been more supportable, than

his dealing with such contumacious impenitent cities of Judea.'—*Paraphrase on Matt. x, 15, and Annotations on Matt. iii, 2.*

BISHOP PEARCE says, 'In the day of judgment: i. e. in the day of the destruction of the Jewish state, called the coming of the Son of man, verse 23.' He adds, in a Note, 'The sense of this verse seems to be this: that which formerly befel Sodom and Gomorrah, was more tolerable than what shall befall this city. That the day of judgment, here mentioned, is to be thus understood, appears from what is said concerning Capernaum, in chap. xi, 23, compared with verses 22 and 24, of the same chapter. Univ. Hist. v. iv. p. 210.'—*Commentary and Note on Matt. x, 15.*

Dr. SEILER says, 'Perhaps in this passage Jesus had a view to the terrible events which were coming on those cities and their inhabitants in the approaching war, and which were such as the people were then accustomed to regard as divine judgments.' He indeed thinks it also possible that Christ may have referred to a judgment in the next world.—*Seiler's New Testament, zu Matt. x, 15.*

WAKEFIELD translates the text thus: 'Verily I say unto you, it will be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in a day of judgment, than for,' &c. And he adds this Note: 'em hemera kriseos, in a day of vengeance, punishment, or trial. This is undoubtedly the genuine sense of the phrase, which has not the least reference to the day of general judgment. All that our Savior intends to say is, that when the temporal calamities of that place come upon it, they will be more severe than even those of Sodom and Gomorrah. See this phrase employed in precisely the same meaning, by the LXX. in Prov. vi, 34, where, instead of *kriseos*, Aquilla and Theodotion have *ekdikeseos*: Isa. xxxiv, 8, and my commentary on this place. Our Savior, I apprehend, had Jerusalem principally in view in this declaration.—*Wakefield's New Testament, Matt. x, 15, and note in loco.*

Dr. A. CLARKE says, 'In the day of judgment: or, punishment, *kriseos*. Perhaps not meaning the day of general judgment, nor the day of the destruction of the Jewish state by the Romans; but, a day in which God should send punishment on that particular city, or on that person, for their crimes. So the day of judgment of Sodom and Gomorrah was the time in which the Lord destroyed them by fire and brimstone from the Lord out of heaven.'—*Commentary on the New Testament, on Matt. x, 15.*

To the foregoing we may add the Unitarian authors of the 'Improved Version' of the New Testament, and Mr. Kenrick, a Unitarian commentator, all believers in the common doctrine of a day of future judgment. The former translate the text, after Wakefield's manner, thus: 'Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, in a day of judgment, than for that city.' And the latter is inclined to refer this and the parallel passages to the destruction of the Jewish state.—*Improved version, &c., on Matt. x, 15. Kenrick's Commentary on the New Testament, on Matt. x, 15, compared with xi, 23, 24.\**

\*Poole, in his Synopsis Criticorum on Matt. x, 15 refers to Piscator also, as applying the text to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. In his regular commentary on Matthew, however, Piscator refers it to a

Such is the judgment of these authors, whom none will suspect of any partial bias in favor of the application to a time of temporal calamity, since all their prejudices of a general kind would have naturally disposed them to the contrary. Of course, we conclude, that intimately acquainted as most of them were with the character of Scripture language, and in particular with that of the New Testament Greek, they did not discover, in the future tense of the verb, any objection of moment against their interpretation. We must, indeed, confess that, so far as our knowledge extends, no example can be adduced that is altogether parallel with the anomaly supposed to be found in this case; but every body who has read the original, knows that the tenses are not there used with the same precision as in our own language at the present day, and that instances often occur which can be reduced to no fixed rule either of grammar or of rhetoric. Even the mere English reader of the Bible must have observed that, in strong expressions, the verbs as well as the other parts of speech frequently assume a license, equally irregular, if not precisely the same in form. Thus, the prophet Ezekiel says to Jerusalem, 'thine elder sister is Samaria, she and her daughters, that dwell at thy left hand;' though his meaning was, that they dwelt there at that time, but that they had dwelt there; since it appears from what the prophet afterwards said, that they were then carried away into captivity. 'And thy younger sister,' adds he, 'that dwelleth at thy right hand, is Sodom and her daughters;' though it is well known that Sodom and her daughters had not dwelt there, for ages. Other instances might be alleged of as great a latitude in the use of tenses as the authors just quoted have implicitly attributed to the text under consideration.

In order to prevent, as far as possible, our interpretation from being affected by prejudices derived from our own doctrine, we shall examine the text independently of the leading question, whether the Scriptures teach a day of judgment in the future state. Let the only inquiry be, What is the most natural meaning of this one passage in particular, and of its parallel passages? Now, it should not be overlooked, that our Savior here speaks of the *land* of Sodom and Gomorrah: 'it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah;' an expression plainly referring to their earthly and political existence. Had he meant to allude to them as a class of individuals in the world of spirits, would it not be absurd rather than natural or striking, to call them the land of Sodom and Gomorrah? We do not ask whether it is possible that he could use this form for that purpose; the

future judgment. Poole may have alluded to some of his other works. Piscator was an orthodox commentator, and a Professor of Theology at Strasburg.

\*Ezek. xvi, 46—56. Perhaps the nearest approach to a parallel phrase is to be found in our Savior's solemn protestation concerning his prophecy of the fall of Jerusalem, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away; of which, it is now generally agreed, the meaning was, It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for my words to pass away. (Matt. xxiv, 35; Mark xiii, 31; Luke xii, 18.) Here, as in the case of the text in question, the object manifestly is to express a comparison in the most striking manner.



proper question is, would it be likely thus to occur to any speaker either as a simple or as a customary phraseology, or even in the way of strong and vehement diction? If not, we ought by no means so to apply it, without apparent necessity. To us there appears a very impressive figure in the transfer of the tense, representing the judgments on both the ancient and the existing cities as inflicted at the same time, and thus rendering the comparison the more vivid, and the contrast the more striking. But what propriety or force there would be in carrying the land of Sodom into the future world, we cannot conceive. Again: we must observe that the literal translation of the next phrase, is, not 'the day of judgment,' as it stands in our common version, but, 'a day of judgment,\*' meaning whatsoever time in which God should see fit to administer retribution to that city: 'It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, in a day of judgment, than for that city,' and so ought the parallel texts to be translated. Of course, the allusion here is not intended to point out in a direct manner any one fixed and definite period, such as the *last and general judgment* is supposed to be; but to recognize the fact, in a general way, that a time of recompense would come. And this time seems left to be more particularly defined by the succeeding context, in which Christ assures his disciples, that notwithstanding all the persecutions and dangers they were to encounter, he that should 'endure to the end,' would be saved. 'Verily I say unto you,' adds he, 'ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come.'† The 'end' here mentioned, and this coming of the Son of man, were, without question, events then near at hand, and probably those connected with the destruction of the Jewish state.

The interpretation suggested by the foregoing considerations, will be confirmed, if we now proceed to examine the parallel passages. The text on which we have thus far remarked, is quoted from St. Matthew's record of Christ's address to his twelve disciples, on first sending them forth to preach and to work miracles. St. Mark records, though much more briefly, the same address; and here we find in the common copies of his gospel, the same expression, almost verbatim: 'Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment [*literally*, in a day of judgment,] than for that city.‡ But these words are said to be spurious, and to have been interpolated in this place from the corresponding passage in St. Matthew.¶ We therefore pass them by. Only two other texts are found, that can be considered parallel.

One is in the eleventh chapter of St. Matthew's gospel: 'Then began he [*Christ*], to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not. Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment [*literally*, in a day of judgment,] than for you.'

\*The article is omitted in the Greek text. Bishop Middleton, who wrote a large and celebrated treatise to illustrate the usage of the Greek article, tacitly admits that according to all the established rules it ought to have been found here in the original, if the reference was to the last and general judgment; though he still contends, on other grounds, that this must have been the judgment alluded to.—*Doctrine of the Greek Article*, Pt. ii. on Matt. x. 15.

†Matt. x. 23, compared with verses 15—22.

‡Mark vi. 11.

¶Griesbach rejects them, and stamps them with his strongest mark of a spurious reading. See his *New Testament in loco*.

And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell, [*literally*, to the place of the dead;] for if the mighty works which have been done in thee had been done in Sodom, it would have remained unto this day. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment [*literally*, in a day of judgment] than for thee.\*

Here it is manifest that all the assertions (excepting, for the argument's sake, the particular phrase in question,) related to temporal concerns and circumstances. The address was made to cities rather than to individuals. Tyre, Sidon and even Sodom would have repented and remained unto that day, (such would have been the consequence,) had the mighty works been wrought in them, which were done in Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum. Since these cities, therefore, continued still impenitent, they would whenever their time of retribution should arrive, be visited with a more intolerable judgment, than that of the former. And the general character of this judgment is plainly enough intimated: Capernaum, which was highly exalted, should fall to the very depths of desolation; as we find it actually did, probably in the approaching Jewish war, so that even its site cannot be now ascertained. If, then, those explicit ideas that form the chief links in the chain of thought which runs through this passage, may be allowed to aid in the explanation of the more doubtful phrase, all will be clear.

The remaining text is in the tenth chapter of St. Luke's Gospel; and it deserves the more careful notice, since it is evidently but a repetition both of the passage just quoted from St. Matthew, and of that which stands at the head of this article. 'But into whatsoever city ye enter and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say, Even the very dust of your city which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you. Notwithstanding, be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable, in that day, for Sodom than for that city. Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at [in,] the judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be thrust down to hell [*literally*, to the place of the dead.†] The same remarks that were made on the preceding passage, might be applied also to this. And, in addition, it should be observed that what is called 'a day of judgment,' in the leading text of this article, is here called 'that day,' referring apparently to the time of 'the kingdom of God,' mentioned just before as having already 'come nigh.' This day of the kingdom of God was probably the period in which the Jewish state was to be destroyed;‡ certainly it was a time which had already 'come nigh,' and which, therefore, cannot still be future.

Thus if we mistake not, all the circumstances of the case—the context of the passage, the general tenor of the passage itself, the parallel texts, and all the phraseology, except the future tense of the verb—coincide in favor of a reference to the temporal calamities then approaching. The reader will judge whether the tense alone affords sufficient ground for setting aside all these considerations; or whether it may not be more properly regarded as an impressive figure, in a vehement and elliptical sentence.

\*Matt. xi. 20—24.

†Luke x. 10—15.

‡See Art. i. § 2, of the Univ. Expositor, vol. i.

FROM THE MAGAZINE AND ADVOCATE.

## RELIGIOUS PUFFING.

Every subject has a character in some respects peculiar to itself, and has a particular phraseology attached to it, which is less appropriate when applied to any other. Nature has provided for these things, in the sympathies and emotions with which she has kindly favored us. And she is true to her trust, and uniform in her dictates—having strongly marked the line of discrimination between different subjects and different men.

Thus, the subjects which relate to science and philosophy, are treated with gravity, and the terms in which they are described, are plain and definite: on the contrary, subjects of mere amusement, receive an appropriate style of language. Were we to describe a scene of joy in the language of lamentation, or one of mourning in the words of hilarity, every person would perceive and feel the incongruity. So, again, when we mean to delineate character, we never think of applying the same terms and epithets to persons whose mental characteristics, professions and pursuits are wholly dissimilar. For instance, who would describe Dr. Johnson, in the terms and phrases which he would apply to Garrick—or portray the rigid and uncompromising integrity of Luther, in the language with which he would distinguish the facetious Sterne?

Some few subjects have, by a kind of public license—at least by common consent—obtained the unenviable prerogative of being described and known almost exclusively by the language of hyperbole. And in consequence, the professions and persons connected with these subjects, are distinguished for the use of the most extravagant terms of exaggeration. An auctioneer's bill, or a lottery ticket vender's scheme, will furnish the reader an illustration of this subject, that no language can convey. This mode of crying up and describing things, is called *puffing*, and when used in relation to the subjects, and by the class of men above named, passes for what it is worth, and no one is deceived. But when applied to other things and other men, it leads to mistakes, produces false impressions, and for the gratification of some one person, disgusts a thousand.

But of all the places, in which the practice of puffing prevails, the church is the most unsuitable—of all possible subjects, religion least needs such aid—and of all men in the whole world, preachers are the very last to whom it should be applied. Will religious men speak of the devotional services of the sanctuary, in the terms with which they would describe a comedy—and the labors of a decent clergyman, as they would of some eminent opera singer, or mountebank?

Universalist preachers, who are not editors of papers, certainly feel grateful for every well meant courtesy from those that are, but we beg permission respectfully, but earnestly, to remonstrate against the use of terms calculated to convey the notion of anything very extraordinary, either in the talents, acquirements, or eloquence of any of us. As a denomination, it is notorious that there is nothing very remarkable about us—unless it be the fact, that with so few resources we have succeeded so well, and sustained ourselves against all opposition.

In the name of charity, then, let us neither be spoken of in the terms of adulation, appropriated to the native sovereigns of some oriental countries—nor yet in the flippant hyperbole which describes the wares of an auction room. And as we are neither the one nor the other of these things—neither are we in general, to be bought or sold—we must be excused for not seeing the propriety of such descriptions. We are as far from feeling the least gratifica-



tion in this species of praise, as we are from deserv-  
ing the fulsome and adulatory epithets in which  
it is expressed. We, however, make this apology  
for editors, that they but follow out a prece-  
dent which were better expunged from the can-  
ons of publication.

Ministers of religion are so much like other men  
as to be susceptible of all the feelings of pride  
and ambition, common to others. They should  
not, therefore, be flattered—much less should they  
flatter each other. It is probably due to them,  
and for their encouragement, to know that their  
labors are acceptable for faithfulness and well-  
doing. But it cannot be necessary for this pur-  
pose, that their abilities, or their efforts, be spo-  
ken of in terms, which, if they are worth any  
thing, are only calculated to foster false ideas of  
one's own consequence.

Take the following as a sample of religious  
puffing—but which wants much of the union  
which of late, marks some of these proofs of  
"brotherly kindness." In a grave account of a  
religious meeting, you find something very like  
this: "The Rev. Mr. A. B. delivered a discourse  
in his best style; as he always does—the lan-  
guage was chaste, rich, and pathetic. The con-  
gregation, which was very respectable and nu-  
merous, gave the most fixed attention, and seem-  
ed wrapped in ecstasy, by the full and bursting  
eloquence of the speaker. We had the pleasure,  
too, of meeting our young Br. C. D. who is  
already distinguished for his fine, bold and im-  
petuous style of oratory, and from the specimen  
he gave us, in a very appropriate and interesting  
prayer, we predict he will soon rank among our  
most eminent speakers." At another time, we  
are told in substance, that, "Br. E. F. whose con-  
version to Universalism we announced a few  
weeks since, has been installed pastor of the new  
society in G. H. With his known talents, piety,  
zeal, and truly classic attainments, the happiest  
results may be anticipated. His colloquial tal-  
ents are of the first order, and he is rich in bib-  
lical lore!"

Now we appeal to the candid, if something  
very like this disgusting flummery, does not  
often pass under the eye, in running over the  
columns of a religious paper. A stranger is fill-  
ed with admiration, and is all impatience to see  
and hear these extraordinary men. By and by,  
one of these great, learned, talented and elo-  
quent old, or young men, makes his appearance,  
when—lo! he differs very little from other men  
of his profession!

But unhappily it sometimes occurs, that these  
fine descriptions are wholly gratuitous—neither  
suits the case nor the man. And the writer  
of this article knows of more than one instance,  
where nothing but an utter ignorance of the  
subject, can apologize for the use of the grossest  
terms of praise. These things, instead of bene-  
fitting, really injure those to whom they are ap-  
plied—and what is of more importance, they are  
often, and perhaps justly looked upon by our lay  
brethren, as pitiful attempts to bring into noti-  
riety, those concerning whom they feel them-  
selves abundantly capable of forming correct  
opinions.

Tendering our acknowledgements to those  
editors to whom any puffing obligations may be  
due, we beg they will accept the above as our  
humble view of the impropriety of religious puff-  
ing.  
S. R. S.

#### CHRIST THE FIRST FRUITS.

There is a beautiful and significant figure used  
by St. Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthi-  
ans (xv, ch.) in which Christ is compared to the  
first fruits, which the Israelites were accus-  
tomed to offer in sacrifice at the commencement  
of the annual harvest. Having previously stated  
that if Christ be not raised, the faith of christians  
is vain, he says—"But now is Christ risen from

the dead and become the first fruits of them that  
slept.

The first comparison implied in this figure is  
founded on the idea that after the first fruits, the  
whole harvest will be gathered in. The hope of  
the christian is, that as Christ, the first fruits of  
them that slept, has been raised; so the whole  
multitude of the human family will rise from  
the dead to an immortal and glorious state of  
being. In this particular the comparison holds  
good, and is fully sustained by the connected  
language. The apostle adds, v. 22, "For, as in  
Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made  
alive." "Thanks be to God," for this tri-  
umph over the dreary notion of annihilation,  
and the false fear of the final destruction of all  
or some part of the intellectual offspring of  
our Heavenly Father! O grave! Where is thy  
victory?

The second comparison is founded on the idea  
that the first fruits are a sample of the quality of  
the coming harvest. The indication given in  
this significant figure is, that as Christ was raised  
to an elevated moral condition, so mankind will  
be raised to the same moral elevation, or to a  
state of moral purity. This very important  
point the apostle has particularly set forth. Af-  
ter saying that the first man is Adam, and that  
the second man is Christ, that the former is earthy  
and the latter is heavenly, he says—"And as we  
have born the image of the earthy (or Adam,) we  
shall also bear the image of the heavenly (or  
Christ.)" v. 49.

In consideration of these beautiful compari-  
sons, included in the figure of the first fruits, we  
must consider this among the most pleasing  
scriptural metaphors. It alludes to the past  
sacrifices of God's people, when, at the com-  
mencement of harvest, they came and offered  
the first fruits of the earth to God, who had  
blessed their labors and was crowning the year  
with his goodness. And it looks forward to that  
richer harvest, and more glorious consumma-  
tion, when the vast human family will be raised  
in the image of Christ, made "heirs of God and  
joint heirs with Christ," and delivered from all  
their infirmities, sins and sorrows in this mortal  
state. The consolation which these considera-  
tions afford to all men of every condition, is su-  
perior to all other consolations afforded by reli-  
gion.—*Christian Pilot.*

#### A REQUEST.

Our readers will recollect that the two editors  
of this paper, with Rev. T. J. Sawyer, of New-  
York, were appointed at the last session of the  
Hudson River Association, a committee to col-  
lect information in relation to the state of Uni-  
versalism within its territorial limits, correspond  
with societies, and make report at the next ses-  
sion of that body.

But little progress has been made in this busi-  
ness, and the committee can make but little pro-  
gress without the friendly aid of their brethren  
in different places.

The territorial limits of the association include  
all the counties bordering on the Hudson River,  
from its source to its mouth, and the committee  
would be glad to have from every town an an-  
swer to the following questions.

Is there a Universalist society in your town?  
If so, when was it formed? How many mem-  
bers does it contain? What are the names of  
its officers, and how much of the time is it sup-  
plied with preaching? If there is no society;  
are there any Universalists in your town?  
If so, how many? Who are the prominent men?  
Have you any preaching? And could you do  
any thing for the establishment of a circuit which  
would supply you? We are persuaded that if  
the committee could obtain answers to these  
questions, a mass of intelligence would be col-  
lected, which would astonish our friends even, and

alarm our enemies, while it would cheer our  
hearts and encourage our hands in the good  
work.

Our request therefore is, that our friends scat-  
tered abroad will think of these things. Let  
not one wait for another, but sit down and com-  
municate to the editors of this paper, or if more  
convenient, to Rev. T. J. Sawyer, New-York,  
an answer to these questions as far as practicable.  
Will Br. Sawyer insert this or a similar notice  
in the Messenger.—*Gospel Anchor.*

#### ANCIENT BOOK.

We present below another extract, from the  
book noticed in our last, entitled "The Whole  
Armor of God." We remarked last week, that  
the Devil held a conspicuous place in the work,  
and we might confine our extracts more particu-  
larly to him. The following quotation, as will  
be perceived, relates to the "extent" of Satan's  
power. From the portrait he must be a fearful  
being indeed.  
P.

#### OF THE EXTENT OF SATAN'S POWER.

For the third, the extraordinary power of the  
Diabol consisteth in this, that he can do any thing  
whatsoever is in the compass of nature, and  
may be effected by natural means. For exam-  
ple, he can violently move the ayre, and cause  
tempests and stormes: he can inflame the ayre,  
and cause thunder and lightning; yea, and ex-  
traordinary fire to fall downe: he can exceed-  
ingly trouble the Seas, and cause such waues  
and billowes to arise, as shall swallow vp ships  
and men: he can cause waters to swell over the  
bancks, and so make great breaches. On earth  
he can cause earth-quakes, he can throw downe  
the strongest buildings, and roote vp the best  
settled trees, and moove all things: hee can  
carry and hurly vp and downe even in the ayre  
the bodies of men and beastes; yea, hee can  
enter into them, and make them with violence  
rush and runne headlong hither and thither:  
hee can cast them into the fire and water, grie-  
uously vex and torment them, and inflict sore  
diseases vpon them; he can possesse them,  
make them lunatick, dumb, deafe, blinde; make  
them foame and roare out, and all to rent them;  
he can stirre vp wrath, pride, couetousnesse,  
lust, and the like passions in men; he can know  
the disposition of men, and accordingly lay baits  
for them, or bring them vnto baits; hee can  
darken mens understanding, and cause much  
trouble and anguish in their soule and con-  
science; yea, so much as they cannot endure it  
but are brought to make away themselves; hee  
can incense man against man, Kingdome against  
Kingdome, Subjects against Princes, Princes  
against subjects, and so cause quarrels, warres,  
treasons, rebellions, oppressions, murders, &c.  
Many more strange mischiefs can he worke,  
which for kinde are extraordinarily wonderfull,  
and for number innumerable.

#### TRAVLING AGENT.

We have pleasure in stating that Br. S. J. HILLIER  
is now travelling on an agency for this Paper, in col-  
lecting, and procuring subscribers. He designs visit-  
ing the principal places within a convenient distance  
of this city, during this winter. Any facilities our  
friends in different places can afford him will be thank-  
fully acknowledged.

#### WANTED.

An active intelligent Boy, 14 to 15 years of  
age, as an Apprentice to the Printing Business.  
One from the country would be preferred. Ap-  
ply at this office. March 1833.

#### WANTED.

A Girl to do the work of a small family. One  
disposed to make herself agreeable and useful, will  
find a permanent situation by making application  
at 85 1/2 Bowery.



## ON REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

BY AN EMINENT CONGREGATIONAL MINISTER.

I have endeavored to guard my people against an error too common, where religious conferences are much attended: I mean, substituting these in the place of divine institutions and making them a kind of *thermometer*, by which to prove the degree of heat and cold in religious zeal. When we hear of a *revival* of religion in any place, the unusual frequency and the general attendance of lectures and conferences by day and night, are adduced as decisive evidences of it. When these meetings become less frequent, or less full, it is said, "Religion appears to be on the decline." We ought always to place religion where the scripture has placed it, in holiness of heart and life; and to regard devotional duties as instrumental to this end. We are never to place the essence of religion in things which are but the means of it.

A serious man from a neighboring parish, being one evening at my house on secular business, took occasion to inform me, that there was a great revival of religion in his vicinity. I expressed my satisfaction in the intelligence: but asked him, wherein the happy revival discovered itself: whether the people appeared to be more humble, more condescending, more meek and peaceable, more kind and charitable, better united in their social relations, more virtuous in their manners, &c. He could not answer particularly with respect to these things; but said, "People were much engaged in attending religious meetings; they had private lectures as often as any transient preacher could be obtained; and they had conferences very frequently, almost every evening." I observed to him, that an attendance on the word preached was highly important, and a hopeful indication; but asked him how it was on the *Lord's day*; whether they attended on the instituted worship of *that day* better than they used to do: (for I knew they had been shamefully negligent of that duty.) "Why, no," said he, "we don't go to meeting on the Sabbath." What, I inquired, do you neglect God's institutions to observe your own? The prophet marks this as a token of the decay of religion among the Jews. He answered, "We do not like our parish minister very well." I observed to him, that if they had a minister, who did not preach the gospel, this was a reason why he should leave the pulpit; and not why they should leave the *meeting house*; and they ought to take regular measures for his removal, and the introduction of a better man. "O," said he, "I don't pretend, but that he preaches the gospel; but there are some subjects, on which he does not preach." Perhaps he preaches on them when you are absent. He continued, "I don't like his *manner* of preaching. He is not so fervent, so engaged, as I wish; he uses his notes too much," &c. Friend, said I, you well remember, that Paul, Apollos, and Cephas, all preached in Corinth. They preached the same gospel; but had different voices, and different modes of speaking. And among their hearers, one said, I am of Paul; another, I am of Apollos; and a third, I am of Cephas. Now on this occasion, Paul told them they were *carnal*. Apply this to yourself. On the authority of Paul, I tell you that you are *carnal*. He answered, "I do not see, but that it is so." He had the honesty to confess his fault; whether he had the virtue to reform, I do not know.

Occasional meetings and private conferences may be useful, if properly conducted; but they are matters of christian discretion, not of divine institution. I know of no apostolic precept or example, which elevates these to a place among the institutions of God. When Paul came to Troas, where was a christian church, and doubtless some stated place for public worship, he waited seven days for the return of the first day

of the week, on which day the disciples were wont to come together for social worship. Then he spake to them, and continued his speech to an unusual length.

When he preached in Ephesus, where a church was not formed, "he taught publicly, and from house to house." As the christians had no stated place in which they could claim the privilege of assembling, they convened where they could. Paul first taught in the Jewish synagogue; meeting with opposition there, he removed to the school of Tyrannus, and here he continued for a length of time teaching daily.

His teaching, though from house to house, from the synagogue to the school, where he could obtain leave, was *public* not *private*. His teaching daily in the school was incompatible with his spending much time in *private houses*. He always chose the most *open manner* of teaching. He never imitated those seducers who creep into *private houses*.—*Memoir prefixed to Dr. Lathrop's Posthumous Ser.* pp. 31–34 Springfield, 1821.

## DAY OF JUDGMENT.

A DIALOGUE.

*Inquirer.* But when is reconciliation to take place? Is it after the day of judgment.

*Minister.* It is to be completed at the close of the day of judgment, "when all things shall be subdued unto Christ." By "day of judgment," I understand the kingdom or reign of Christ; "for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet," "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." Who shall judge the quick and the dead at *his appearing and his kingdom*." By these quotations it is evident that Christ is to judge mankind, and that he is to do it at *his appearing and his kingdom*; and this is further confirmed by his words to his disciples: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his Angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in *his kingdom*." This declaration of our Lord teaches that Christ should reward every man according to his works *when he should come*; and that some who stood with him should live to see him coming in *his kingdom*. The kingdom or reign of Christ, therefore, commenced in the generation in which he was on earth, and is to continue till "all are made alive in Christ." "Then cometh the end when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father." And as this is the time in which every man is to be rewarded according to his works, it is "the day of judgment." The gospel age is frequently called "*the day*," "*that day*," &c. in the Old Testament. St. Paul teaches explicitly; that the reward at the judgment seat of Christ, is to be received *in body*; for leaving out the words which the translators added, and which are printed in *italic type* to show that they were added, it will read thus. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things in body, according that he hath done, whether good or bad."

*Inquirer.* But how are men rewarded according to their works in this life? Are not the wicked here as prosperous as the righteous?

*Minister.* The reward of mankind for their obedience or disobedience does not consist merely in prosperity or adversity, health or sickness; but it depends on the state of mind with which things are received. "We know," says St. Paul, "that all things work together for good to them that love God." But "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish," is the portion to those who do evil. "Great peace have they that love thy law," but "there is no peace, saith my God to the wicked." The person who is reconciled to God receives every dispensation of

his providence, as a blessing bestowed by a kind and merciful parent; while the person who is unreconciled to him receives every thing as a judgment. The reward of one is justification, peace and joy; the punishment of the other is condemnation, sorrow and tormenting fear. One enjoys spiritual life; the other suffers moral death. "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished; but the seed of the righteous shall be delivered."—"Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner." The idea that mankind are not recompensed in this life according to their deserts, seems to arise from want of reflection on the fact that "the Most High ruleth," that they are under the perfect moral government of God, and from disregarding the truth that we are happy or miserable, not according to our outward appearance, but as we are reconciled or unreconciled to the character and laws of God. It is from ignorance of the fact that sin and misery are inseparably connected, so that a person might as well take coals of fire into his bosom and not be burned, as to disobey the commands of God and not receive condemnation. A state of unreconciliation is always a state of punishment; and a state of reconciliation is always a state of happiness. We cannot determine the exact amount of sin of which any person is guilty; for one may be more criminal in *design*, without ever manifesting it to us by any act, than another is who has perpetrated what we may consider the most heinous offences; but God knoweth the heart, and often "that which is highly esteemed among men, is abomination in the sight of God." And knowing as he does the exact amount of guilt, he can, and I believe he does apply the just punishment. But this is done in mercy, to convince the person of the folly of seeking happiness from the husks of sensual gratification, and to cause him to return to obedience, and partake of the rich provisions of the gospel.

## SCRIPTURE ILLUSTRATION.

They love to pray standing in the synagogues, and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Matt. vi. 5.

Such was the ostentatious devotion of the Pharisees. Retirement and privacy were not considered either as necessary or desirable in prayer. This part of their conduct is still imitated by many persons, especially among the Mohammedans. An aged Turk is particularly proud of a long flowing white beard, a well shaved cheek and head, and a clean turban. It is a common thing to see such characters, far past the bloom of life, mounted on stone seats, with a bit of Persian carpet, at the corner of the streets, or in front of their bazars, combing their beards, smoking their pipes, or drinking their coffee, with a pitcher of water standing beside them, or saying their prayers, or reading the koran.—*Richardson's Travels.*

There are those to whom a sense of religion has come in storm and tempest; there are those whom it has summoned amid scenes of revelry and idle vanity; there are those, too, who have heard its 'still small voice' amid rural leisure and placid contentment. But perhaps the knowledge which causeth not to err, is most frequently impressed upon the mind during seasons of affliction, and tears are the softened showers which cause the seed of heaven to spring and take root in the human breast.—*Sir Walter Scott.*

Funerals in the country are always more impressive. The stroke of death makes a wide space in the village circle, and is an awful event in the tranquil uniformity of rural life. The death bell tolls its knell in every ear; it steals with its pervading melancholy over every hill and vale, and saddens all the landscape.—*Iving.*



## CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

EDITED BY T. J. SAWYER AND P. PRICE, NEW-YORK,  
AND ABEL C. THOMAS, PHILADELPHIA.

SATURDAY, MARCH 9, 1833.

## NOTICE.

The fourth Lecture in reply to the Lectures of the Rev. Dr. Brownlee, against Universalism, will be delivered in the Orchard street Church to-morrow evening, March 10.

## CHEAP PAMPHLETS.

We have commenced, and propose continuing as opportunity may offer, the publication of a course of small pamphlets, which may be afforded at a low price, for the convenience of distribution, by our friends. They will comprise such articles, that are passing through the columns of the Messenger, as may be regarded serviceable to lay before community. We have already published a large edition of "Important Questions, with Scripture Answers," which are furnished at 50 cents per 100—The "Correspondence" between a member of the Reformed Dutch Church and a Universalist, at \$2 per 100, and the Christmas Sermon, by R. O. Williams, (inserted in No. 16,) at \$2 per 100. The series of Letters now addressing Dr. Brownlee, by the senior Editor, will also be put in the same form. Our friends, both in the City and Country, are requested to aid us in the business, by ordering supplies of them, P.

## VARIOUS ITEMS—NO. II.

'Self love to prompt, and reason to control.'

The 'greatest amount of happiness,' is the object of universal pursuit. No man wittingly and willingly renders himself miserable. Our errors, when in pursuit of happiness, are errors of the judgment, and not of the will—in other words, they are errors of the head, and not of the heart. If I am induced to believe, that, by defrauding my neighbor, the advantages will be greater than the disadvantages, my desire for happiness will prompt to the fraud. Reason is given to control this self love; and cannot be better employed than in convincing mankind that duty and interest are identified—that no man can promote his true interest by a neglect or violation of his duty—that he who faithfully performs his duty, will thus effectually subserve his true interest. When Solon was modelling his laws, a friend laughed at his undertaking, and endeavored to show the absurdity of attempting thus to prevent injustice. Solon replied—'Men keep their agreements when it is an advantage to both parties not to break them; and I will so frame my laws as to make it evident to the Athenians that it will be more for their interest to observe than to transgress them.'

I would that this sentiment of the great lawgiver were written on the tablet of every heart. We should then hear nothing of the pernicious idea, that there is 'pleasure in sin.' God has given us laws for our moral government; and it is not reasonable to suppose that Infinite and Disinterested Love has given us a law, without knowing that obedience thereto would increase our happiness. He has not required us to perform any thing opposed to our present true interest. Our interest is our duty—our duty is our interest, and he who allows the truth of these remarks, will acknowledge that it is as much a *privilege*, as a *duty*, to be virtuous.

A. C. T.

LETTERS TO THE REV. DR. BROWN-  
LEE—NO. IV.

Rev'd and Dear Sir,—

Having already considered your preliminary observations, and offered a few remarks upon your text, I shall now proceed to an examination of the first position which you formally assume against Universalism. It is based on the supposed analogy existing between this world and the future, and laid down in the following very decided manner.

"There is nothing in the general aspect of divine providence which favors the idea that man shall not be punished in the future state—on the contrary many things induce the belief that God will punish, and even to all eternity."

We, I doubt not, are fully agreed in our belief that all men shall be raised from the dead, and rendered immortal. Whether this important truth might, with some degree of probability, be inferred from the general aspect of divine providence, or whether it is brought to light only in the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, is a question which I need not stop here to discuss. That all men, without exception, shall become immortal is, however, a point held in common by both Limitarians and Universalists. And taking this as a truth mutually acknowledged, let us, with all due attention, inquire, what nature and the general government of God in the present state, might lead us to anticipate in the future. This examination, if carefully conducted, will lead us directly to the proper result; for being assured that Jehovah is without variableness or a shadow of turning, that he "is the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever," we may infer with certainty that the great principles of his moral government are now just, and that they will never be changed. In other words, his administration, if not uniform in all its details, is still tending to one grand result. If we can learn therefore, the present character of God, and consequently, of his government, we may reasonably conclude what they will be hereafter. Should we find the Deity "a hard master" here, reckless of human happiness, or what is worse, delighting in human misery, it may convince us that since he is immutable, eternity may only present repeated displays of violence and crime on the one part, and wrath and revenge on the other. But should we, on the contrary, discover that God is now kind even to the unthankful and the evil, and that he remembers in mercy those who forget him; should we learn that, although he does by no means clear the guilty, he yet chastises in love, we may conclude, with equal certainty, that such will be his administration forever.

Few, at the present day, are willing to avow the abominable opinion that God created some men merely to damn them! And yet it is to be feared, if the popular human creeds were strictly analyzed, this sentiment, revolting as it may be to every Christian's heart, and spurned as it is when plainly expressed, is still unequivocally implied in them, and that from it alone results one of the most horrid dogmas, it ever entered the heart of man to conceive. Be this as it may, however, enlightened Christians are now generally agreed that God was benevolent in the creation of the human race. But while this great truth is almost universally acknowledged, it seems not to be so generally realized that it totally and forever subverts the long cherished doctrine of endless misery. If the divine benevolence was displayed in the creation of man, it must necessarily accompany him through all the subsequent changes of his existence. If we deny this,

we must adopt the conclusion, either that God himself will change, which is impossible; or that he did not foresee the conduct of man and consequently has been disappointed, which is absurd. To suppose that God created an individual, foreknowing that by any means he would certainly become endlessly wretched, is at once to annihilate every particle of benevolence in the act. You may reply that God did not design this misery. What, then, did he design? The happiness of his creature? Well, either that happiness must be secured, or the design of God is frustrated forever. The former result is Universalism—the latter atheism unfledged.

If we contemplate the ordinary dealings of God with the children of men, we shall discover little, which, even in appearance, could affect the foregoing conclusion relative to the divine benevolence. In the language of inspiration, "The Lord is good to all; and his tender mercies over all his works." Ps. cxlv, 9. The seasons as they return, seed time and harvest, bear everlasting testimony to his faithfulness and love. "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night" showeth forth of his goodness. Nor are his temporal blessings confined within the narrow limits of his characteristic children. The saint is not exclusively the recipient of his bounties. Even those most ignorant of him are the common objects of his parental care. I need not enlarge on this topic. God has not left himself without witness, among all nations, in that he does good and gives rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling the heart of man with food and gladness. See Acts xiv, 17. Yet notwithstanding these daily, hourly, constant displays of his providential kindness, we are doomed to hear from one of his professed ministers, that "there is nothing in the general aspect of divine providence which favors the idea that man shall not be punished even to all eternity." I cannot conceive how one can cast a single glance over the world, and observe the ten thousand comforts and blessings, which as from an inexhaustible treasure-house are scattered around our race, and yet utter a sentiment so gloomy, and withal so dishonorable to our great Benefactor, as the above. It is a reflection, sir, upon the divine benevolence which I would not—I could not make. Where do you discover a solitary intimation in this wide world—to what single event in the whole history of our species will you refer for proof, that God may punish some of his creatures to all eternity? His ordinary providences speak a different language, and his severest judgments afford no precedent for such unimaginable cruelty: True, the old world perished in its wickedness, while Noah, a preacher of righteousness, and his family alone, survived the universal deluge. True, the cities of the plain in their lust and their crimes went down as in a moment, and the memorials of their overthrow stand now as they have done for centuries, setting forth perpetually an awful example to them who should live ungodly. True, Nineveh, and Babylon, and Jerusalem, and Rome, have all in their turn met the fate that ever awaits the transgressors. The former have left scarce a trace, not of their grandeur, but of their existence, and live now only in history. The latter still remain; but one as the "lone mother of dead empires," the other, a widow, forsaken and "desolate sits upon the ground." What then? Shall we from these and similar examples conclude, that since individuals and states were sinful here, they will be hereafter? and that because the just judgments



of God were inflicted upon them here, those judgments, infinitely aggravated, may be perpetuated throughout eternity? Is it from instances like these that you pretend to deduce a doctrine so momentous and so revolting as endless misery? Is it on such facts that you dare to found your opinion that God's "treatment of the human family is not similar to that of a kind and judicious parent?"

Dr. Brownlee, I beseech you to review this part of the subject. Disenthral yourself for an hour from the bondage of your creed, and like a child of God, and a disciple of Jesus, examine the grounds of your faith. It cannot be that, in your cooler judgment, you would approve this presumptuous sentiment. It is impossible that you would thus recklessly annihilate the very attributes on which you rely for your own salvation. "God's treatment of the human family, not similar to that of a kind judicious parent!" "To whom then will ye liken God?" If he is not a kind judicious parent, what is he? If we may not say unto him in the language prescribed by our divine Master, "*Our Father, who art in heaven,*" teach us, I beseech you, how we shall pray. But farther; how shall we understand the apostle, when he says, "Be ye therefore followers [imitators] of God as dear children?" Eph. v, 1. If he deals with mankind in such a manner as to induce the belief that he will torment them to all eternity, would it not be dangerous to imitate him? The practical results of such opinions, sir, may be seen in the Inquisition to which you have so frequently and tauntingly alluded. The originators of that engine of hell, belied God was not a kind judicious parent. They regarded him as a being whose present government gives full proof that he will torment some of his creatures to all eternity. They followed the exhortation of the apostle and imitated, as far as their feeble ability would permit, the God, I should have said the monster, whom they adored. Yes, sir, we are called upon to imitate God—and to be the children of our Father who is in heaven. But how is this to be done? Not by resorting to the rack, or the fire and faggot, but by *loving our enemies by blessing those that curse us, by doing good to them that hate us.* The inference is irresistible, that in doing thus, we should neither imitate God, nor be his characteristic children, unless it is a truth, as Christ declares, and as Universalists believe, that "*He is kind to the unthankful and to the evil.*"

But, sir, how dare you assert that God's treatment of the human family is not similar to that of a kind judicious parent? In the language of Job "Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his Maker?" Hear our Lord himself, "There is none good but one, that is God." And again, as if he anticipated such attacks upon the parental character of his Father and our Father, and his God and our God, he said, "What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish will he give him a serpent? If ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more, shall your Father in heaven give good things to them that ask him? Matt. vii, 9-11, I know God's thoughts are not our thoughts, nor his ways our ways, but it is only because his thoughts and ways are infinitely higher and better than ours. It is very true that some of the judgments of God are severe, and such as a kind earthly parent could not execute. Among these I might mention the most signal displays of

the divine justice. But these instances fall within the preceding observation with no greater propriety than other events of every day occurrence. Where is the parent, who would lay his beloved child upon a bed of sickness, and for weeks and months leave it to suffer, and at last end its misery only with its existence? Yet we see this on our right hand and on our left, and we see it too as well among the good as the bad. But who from this would dare to deny that God is a kind and judicious parent? We should remember that God sees not as man sees. His counsel embraces the end from the beginning, and he knows full well how to overrule evil so as to produce good. It is a principle in his administration that "weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." Every form of suffering we witness here, may be, perhaps in a manner inscrutable to mortals, the incipient means of a good almost infinitely greater which shall last throughout eternity. Experience teaches us that many things which we once thought to be misfortunes, are now felt to have been blessings in disguise. Why not extend the principle in application to every calamity or evil of life? What a beautiful prospect would this open to the pious mind! How would the believing soul rejoice in contemplating the equal power and wisdom and goodness of its Creator! What a theme would it furnish for love, and gratitude, and praise! In what holy rapture, or pious resignation, might the christian exclaim, "Thy will, O God, not mine be done!" For then would he feel to say with Thompson,

—I cannot go  
Where UNIVERSAL LOVE not smiles around,  
Sustaining all yon orbs and all their Suns;  
From seeming Evil still educing Good  
And Better thence, and Better still,  
In infinite progression.

But alas, alas! this "beautiful theory," as you once in conversation called it, so worthy of God, and so happy for man, must be narrowed down, and made to square with human creeds. It must embrace only the little company of the elect, while the world is left without a Father, to suffer the ever-increasing inflictions of an angry and vindictive God!

Allow me to remind you that the analogical argument is an exceedingly dangerous weapon to be used by a Limitarian. Its only legitimate employment on this question, is by learning the present general character of the divine government, to infer what we might expect for the future. Beyond this it cannot reach. And thus far it is as clear as sunlight in favor of Universalism. The moment you descend from generals, it becomes a two edged sword, and is as likely to destroy as to defend. The same analogical reasoning which would prove that the old world, or Sodom shall suffer eternally, would as well prove that Paul shall be forever goaded by a thorn in the flesh, or that you shall be subject as you now are to the various ills of human life. I will close, sir, by quoting the language of our Savior to the Sadducees, who beset him with analogical arguments against the resurrection. He here dashed a host of analogies to the dust in a single sentence. "Ye do err not knowing the scriptures nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels of God in heaven." Matt. xxii, 2, 30. Whether such can be the subjects of eternal torments, I leave it for your good judgment to decide.

Respectfully &c.

Rev. W. C. BROWNLEE, D. D.

#### SANCTUARIES.

The Marquis Beccaria, in his admirable Essay on Crimes and Punishments, devotes a chapter to a consideration of the justice and expediency of Sanctuaries—that is, places to which if a criminal flee he shall escape the punishment his crimes deserve. The following is the opinion of the erudite author:

"Sanctuaries and impunity differ only in degree; and as the effect of punishments depends more on their certainty than their greatness, men are more strongly invited to crimes by sanctuaries than they are deterred by punishment."

In this opinion, so far as the administration of human governments is concerned, professing christians most cordially concur. Were the principle recognized by the powers that be, that a man who has committed a crime shall not be obnoxious to punishment, provided he can escape to the abode of the Governor—the foundations of civil society would soon be broken up. The laws would lose their restraining influence, and at least a degree of impunity would be the natural consequence. Against this mischievous result, wise legislators will guard with especial care. The penalties attached to laws will be rendered as certain as possible, and all diligence in bringing offenders to justice, will be enjoined on the executive department of the social compact.

Every modification of Partialism supposes a different procedure in the Divine Government. The 'creeds of men' inform us, that the sinner may escape all merited punishment, beside enjoying himself in sin, provided he escape to the abode of Jesus the Governor, an hour before he gives up the Ghost. A sanctuary, differing from impunity only in degree, has thus been provided by the wisdom from beneath. And many of our race have been more strongly invited to transgression by the proffered sanctuary referred to, than deterred by the prospect of uncertain interminable wretchedness.

Beccaria has another remark in his chapter on Sanctuaries, which should be considered in connexion with the sentence already quoted. He says—

"The place of punishment can certainly be no other than that where the crime was committed; for the necessity of punishing an individual for the general good, subsists there, and there only."

The justice and expediency of the procedure here recommended by implication, will not be disputed, so far as human governments are concerned. I speak in reference to the punishing a criminal where he committed the crime. I am not satisfied of the justice of "punishing an individual for the general good." But of this some future opportunity. At present, I will notice only so much of the extract as certifies the justice and expediency of punishing a criminal where the crime was committed. A crime committed in Pennsylvania must be punished in Pennsylvania. There is no sanctuary known to our laws—no transportation for trial and condemnation.

But beside the Sanctuary, the existence of which is supposed by the doctrine of Partialism, and beside the possibility of escaping all punishment, that doctrine teaches the transportation of sinners to a future world, to be tried and condemned for offences committed on this! The conduct of our fathers, who protested against a similar proceeding in the British Government while these States were Colonies, is thus virtually condemned. A. C. T.

Charity suffereth long and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up.



## REPLY TO DR. BROWNLEE.

Rev. Sir—In your note which appeared in the Messenger of last week, I am charged on the authority of one of your clerical friends, with having asserted that "you held the sentiment and had expressed it in your pulpit—that God had from all eternity designed to make some men merely to damn them!" Without in the slightest degree intending to call in question the veracity of your friend, I must be permitted in justice to myself to say that I do not now recollect having made such a declaration. If I did, I now publicly retract it, since you have never to my knowledge expressed such a sentiment, and since you have utterly disclaimed entertaining it. I did, however, on the occasion to which you alluded, avow my conviction that the doctrines of Calvin, and consequently of yourself and your Church, do necessarily involve and clearly imply the idea that *God created some men merely to damn them!* In doing this, sir, I did not forget the creed of the Reformed Dutch Church, from whose language I inferred the sentiment above. You say there is no such sentiment in that creed. Let us appeal to it, and let the public judge. I would not be misunderstood, however, as saying that your Church believes that God created some men merely to damn them. All that I say is, that as I understand its creed, it implies such a sentiment.

Before quoting the language of your Confession of Faith in support of my opinion, it may be proper to offer a few remarks on the distinction you pointed out between the sentiments of *Supralapsarians* and *Sublapsarians*. To me it appears altogether too refined, if not too ideal, for the comprehension of ordinary minds. Indeed like many others of a speculative character, it seems to be a distinction without a difference. When I hear a Calvinist speaking of *eternal election and reprobation*, I cannot but understand him to mean that the decrees of election and reprobation were made from all eternity, and it is extremely difficult for me to conceive how these eternal decrees could be founded on foreknowledge. Yet if I do not misapprehend you, such is your opinion of the subject. The *Sublapsarians*, among whom you class yourself and your Church, held, you tell us, that *God in his infinite mind, viewed men as all fallen, miserable, guilty sinners; all by reason of their own crimes deserving death.*" and consequently in his sovereign love elected some to salvation, and left others to their merited condemnation. This election, then, was predicated entirely on a foreseen fall and condemnation of man. This however is not Calvinism. Calvin says, (Inst. B. III, Chap. xxi. §5,) "But it [predestination] is involved in many evils, especially by those who make foreknowledge the cause of it. We maintain that both belong to God; but it is preposterous to represent one as dependent on the other."

But, let me ask, sir, what is the real difference between the opinions of the *Supralapsarian* and the *Sublapsarian*? The former believes that God created the non-elect on purpose to damn them. The latter spurns the idea that God created any to damn them, but believes him to have created millions and millions, foreseeing that they would deserve eternal death and from which he would never save them. The former is a strict Calvinist; the latter holds a middle ground betwixt Calvinism and Arminianism. In effect however their opinions are the same. For it could not make a fraction's difference in the eternal condition of any individual, whether God gave him existence merely as an endless curse, or whether he gave it him, infallibly foreknowing that it would prove so. Nor would it as I conceive, materially affect the divine character.

But let us turn a moment to your Confession of Faith. In Art. xiii it is said,

"We believe that the same God, after he had created all things, did not forsake them, or give them up to fortune or chance, but that he rules and governs them according to his holy will, so that nothing happens in this world without his appointment: nevertheless, God neither is the author of, nor can be charged with the sins which are committed. For his power and goodness is so great and incomprehensible, that he orders and executes his work in the most excellent and just manner, even then, when devils and wicked men act unjustly."

From language like this, I think the following inferences perfectly legitimate. 1st. That the sin of Adam and the consequent perdition and ruin of our race, were subjects of the divine appointment. 2nd. That by reason of the incomprehensible power and goodness of God, this sin and ruin were ordered and executed in the most excellent and just manner. Now if I am correct your creed either involves a contradiction, or you have departed from its spirit. It is the opinion of *Sublapsarians*, that God did not decree, but only permitted the introduction of sin. But, sir, does the divine appointment imply nothing more than a bare permission. Yet granting that it does not, why did he permit sin? Was it not that he might "manifest himself such as he is, that is to say, merciful and just?" That the Deity created man, and permitted him to sin, without any design, is what I am persuaded you will not allow.

I am astonished, sir, at your unqualified assertion that "there is no such sentiment in Calvin's pages," as that God created some men merely to damn them!! Is it possible that you are so little acquainted with Calvinism at its very fountain? Be so good, sir, as to read the following passages from his Institutes. I have not a copy in the original and quote from Allen's translation, 4to ed. N. York, 1819.

"Predestination we call the eternal decree of God, by which he hath determined within himself, what he would have to become of every individual of mankind. For they are not all created with a similar destiny: but eternal life is foreordained for some, and eternal damnation for others. Every man, therefore, being created for one of these ends, we say he is predestinated either to life or to death." Book III, Chap. xxi. §5.

"Observe: all things being at God's disposal, and the decision of salvation or death, belonging to him, he orders all things by his counsel and decree in such a manner, that some men are born devoted from the womb to certain death, that his name may be glorified in their destruction." B. III. C. xxiii, § 6.

"It is an awful decree, I confess; but no one can deny that God foreknew the future final fate of man before he created him, and that he did foreknow it, because it was appointed by his own decree. \*\*\* Nor should it be thought absurd to affirm that God not only foresaw the fall of the first man, and the ruin of his posterity in him, but also arranged all by the determination of his own will." Ib. ib. §7.

Here, sir is a small specimen of Calvinism in its purity. Calvin was an "old predestinarian," who would have scoffed at the squeamishness manifested by some of his modern disciples. Even Dr. Brownlee, had he lived in Calvin's day, would have been branded as impious. "Predestination," says he, "by which God adopts some to the hope of life, and adjudges others to eternal death, no one desirous of the credit of piety, dares absolutely to deny." And yet Dr. Brownlee does deny it, and "abhors it as a perversion of doctrine equal to any held by Universalists."

Respectfully, Yours,

T. J. SAWYER.

W. C. BROWNLEE, D. D.

The following communication was received last week, but too late for notice in our last No. From the frankness manifested by the writer in giving his name and residence, we are induced to let him speak for himself. He has probably seen before this, that Dr. Brownlee is disposed to defend both himself and the Reformed Dutch Church. This we feel it incumbent on him to do, and the columns of the Messenger will ever be at his service, either for offence or defence. In regard to the writer's request, we have only to observe, that if the Reformed Dutch Church has reason of complaint, we can assure its friends, that Universalists have much more; and that we have not the slightest objection to the writer's correcting any mis-statements on our part, or defending his doctrines, in a reasonable space, through the columns of the Messenger, provided, an equal opportunity is afforded us to correct the errors of Dr. Brownlee, and to defend Universalism, through the columns of the Christian Intelligencer. We would do everything that is fair, and if these conditions are not deemed such, we will listen to any further propositions that "A." may be pleased to make.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

Rev. Mr. Sawyer,

Sir—In your first discourse, delivered in the Orchard-street Church, in reply to the Rev. Dr. Brownlee on Universalism, you stated that you possessed reports of two of Dr. Brownlee's sermons, which had been published in the Christian Intelligencer, and that these reports, having been furnished by a friend of Dr. B's. were without doubt correct. In your two subsequent discourses in reply to Dr. Brownlee, you have commented on a part of the first report, in such terms as would naturally induce your audience to believe that Dr. B. is responsible for the language of those reports. I therefore think it proper to inform you, that those reports were prepared by the writer of this article, and I have reason to know that Dr. Brownlee did not see them until after they had been published in the Christian Intelligencer. I endeavored to give a correct report of his sermons, and I do not know that the Rev. Dr. Brownlee has objected to any of the expressions I used, but I did not attempt to express his arguments in his own language.

As you, sir, have made several erroneous statements respecting the doctrines of the Reformed Dutch Church, and have presented some things as arguments which deserve to be closely examined, I respectfully request the Editors of the Messenger, to allow me the privilege of offering to the public some remarks on your discourses, over the same signature which I adopted in the Intelligencer.

Yours respectfully,

Feb. 27, 1833.

A.

## A REQUEST.

The readers attention is directed to an article on the third page, under the above head, from the Gospel Anchor. Want of room crowded it from the editorial columns, and prevents any further notice this week.

## MARRIED,

In this city on Sunday evening last, by the Rev. T. J. Sawyer, Mr. William H. Chace, and Miss Marcia Alger.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We can very readily "conceive" of a decided necessity for our seeing "Consistency," before complying with his request; and if he is a reasonable person, we can satisfy him of it. We most surely hold the right of determining how far we are answerable to the calls of an anonymous writer; and this too, we think, without any infringement of the principle of candor. When our regulations are complied with, we doubt not in the least, the writer in question will be abundantly able to defend himself without our assistance.



## Original.

## AN EPISTLE

TO MISS J. H. KINNEY.

Sweet songstress! we have never met.  
Yet while in fancy's glass I view thee,  
Tho' worthless be the tribute, let  
A stranger bring her offering to thee.  
Mine is no gifted tongue to thrill  
With "thoughts that breathe and words that burn."  
Mine is no pen whose sweets distill,  
Like drops from genius' glowing urn.  
Yet, lady, while in dreamy mood,  
I've lingered idly o'er thy lines,  
Oft hast thou then before me stood—  
A shadowy form on fancy's shrine.  
Sometimes thou comest gay and fair.  
As forms by burning genius painted,  
Or those bright spirits of the air  
That hover o'er the pure and sainted.  
Sometimes, I see a beauteous face  
In inspiration upward lifted,  
Tho', ('twixt ourselves,) a poetess  
Is seldom with much beauty gifted.  
If to my good glass I repair,  
No flattering picture meets my view,  
For shadows, none but age should wear,  
Are on the brow of twenty-two.  
Of twenty-two! and can it be  
That e'en so long I've walked the world?  
Ah! but a day it seems to me  
Since I was but a little girl!

Yet what of this! I will not grieve;—  
If time to bless my heart, the while  
He steals my youth, will kindly leave  
Me friends, I'll greet him with a smile.  
A smile! the thought has started tears,  
It brings so freshly to my mind  
Those early unsuspecting years,  
When all I saw seem'd good and kind.  
When, too, I fondly deem'd that they,  
O'er whom is shed the gift of song,  
Move as their years glide, swift away,  
In sinless purity along:  
'Twas but a dream! yet I regret  
So dear a dream should ever perish;  
Now, well I know we oft forget  
The holy things our hearts should cherish  
—Forget them, while to baser things,  
By time and chance around us cast,  
Our spirit in its weakness clings,  
To find them worse than frail at last.  
Is it not so with thee—with me?  
Do earth's wild passions never glow  
Where Heaven's pure thoughts alone should be?  
Say, lady, say is it not so?

But, hush my rambling thoughts—and thou,  
For whom these careless lines were penn'd,  
Forgive me if one word should now  
A shadow to thy spirit lend.  
Farewell, thou gentle songstress! never  
Perchance, shall I thy features trace;  
Yet should that Power who governs ever  
Permit me to behold thy face,  
Right willingly that hand of thine  
In cordial greeting mine should press,  
Right gladly would this heart of mine  
Receive a sister poetess.  
But fare-thee-well till then—'twere vain  
On what may be, to longer dwell,  
Then be my only task, again  
To whisper, lady, fare-thee-well!

C. M. S.

## MUSINGS ON LIFE AND DEATH.

BY LUCY HOOPER.

There is no subject on which regret is so often or so commonly expressed as on the passing nature of earthly pleasures, and the changing periods of life. We mourn that childhood must verge into maturity, and maturity change to age. We connect with this change thoughts of "the ruin and the tomb," and forget that this alteration may bring aught of sufficient value to compensate for the gaiety it deprives us of, or give any thing better and dearer than the buoyancy of youthful feeling. In such a mood I watched a group of children at play; they were so light in their motions, so gay, so glad-some, and seemingly so unconscious of evil,

that I could only compare them to a cloud of butterflies on the wing inhaling the fragrance of the bright flowers, and floating onwards in the perfumed breeze of summer. And I sighed to think how soon that mirth would pass, and that gaiety flee, and the sun of pleasure go down to those bright happy things, and care, and age, and sorrow, be their portion. And as I looked on them I saw one go out from among his companions, and laying himself on a bank of flowers was soon wrapped in profound sleep. And strange thoughts of his future life came thronging over me, till I shuddered at the vivid creations of my own fancy: wept to think how often sorrow might pierce that light and glad-some heart, or cares invade the repose of that innocent boy. But perhaps thought I, other and darker evils may fall to his lot; it may be that in youth he will sow the seed of wrong, and reap in his manhood the harvest of dishonor. Yes! passion may debase that mind, and indolence enchain its powers, and sin leave dark traces on its purity. Oh! there are weariness, and pain, and sorrow in the prospect of years—the first bright hours of life are happier far than any after period. Would that I were a fairy to wave a light wand o'er that slumbering boy, to ensure that the bloom should not fade from his cheek, nor the glow pass from his heart—that no clouds should darken his sky, and no harder couch be destined for him than that flowery bank. Oh! there is something so withering in the touch of age, it seems to me like the death-chill to the warm feelings and generous purposes of youth. It is not that age bows down the strength of manhood, that it sivers the dark tresses of youth; no, no, it is the touch upon the heart, that makes one fear his approach. Alas! for the unconscious one! it may be thy lot to feel all this, and give examples of its truth.

I turned bitterly away, for other cares were mine. Was it chance, or accident, or the leading of diviner wisdom than the dark eye of mortality may perceive, which directed my steps to the bed of death? which caused me to stand in the last earthly presence of one whose path had been as the sun which shineth more and more unto the perfect day—one who had met trials but to vanquish them, and came off more than conqueror through him who loved us. One who was revered in life, and whose name would be ever afterwards even "as ointment poured out." There is a moral in such a scene which enters the hardest heart. I stood subdued before its sublimity; I was awed; was it thy presence, King of Terrors? No, I was entranced—rapt—in the dawning glories of immortality. Then it was that I felt that man should not seek only his own good; then it was that I felt why his life should be as a universal blessing, or as the odour of many flowers, a gift of sweetness to all, a something that gives relief to the duldest sense, a renewal of pleasure to the wretched. Yes, it was then that I felt the power of virtue, that I felt the worth of the mental endowments, and the social feelings which God has given us—when the one has proved itself by enlightening mankind, "a spark of divinity"—and the other by blessing all within its reach, an attribute of God. But there was silence and thought in the chamber; peace sat on the countenance of the dying, and we wept not—but we considered his life in our hearts, and were all still, when his deep thrilling voice rose up in the quiet room as he closed his eyes forever on earthly things. "Let me go for the day breaketh."

I left the place in silence; I pondered on the foolishness of my reasoning as regarded the child I have mentioned. I wished no longer for fairy gifts; I bowed myself down before the Majesty of Heaven, and felt that he who has planted the seed will water it, and he who watches its growth will bring it to perfection.

Brooklyn, Feb. 12. N. Y. Weekly Mess.

## GENIUS.

We are exceedingly prone to undervalue the services of our fellows, or rather to calculate them by the apparent ease or difficulty with which they are produced. But who can be a judge of the toils and fatigue of another whose habits and labors are so foreign to our own? Genius is looked upon as a sort of inspiration which exerts itself without effort, and produces its finished gems at a thought. The world deems not that the mind which builds such stupendous monuments of its power, surviving all that human hands have wrought, must labor and faint and agonize, in the execution of its task. They can sympathize with the sturdy laborer who struggles against physical obstacles with incessant sweat and weariness. They can condescend to look with pity upon the baffled power of him who finds his labors to fail of their expected success, and bows to the stern necessity of renewing to-morrow the almost hopeless labors which have been fruitless to-day. They can grieve over the withering strength and constitution of him whose health has been torn from its iron foundation, by the sacrifice of ease and rest to the unsatisfying acquisition of gain. But for the toil and the fatigue, the wrestlings and the frustrated yearnings of the mind the world has no sympathy.

## DORCAS SOCIETY.

Donations in money, dry goods, or cast off clothing will be gratefully received for this Society by Mrs. Durell, No. 27 Roosevelt-street, Mrs. Hammond, No. 413 Grand-street, and at this office. Those having the means and willing to aid in relieving the distresses of the poor during the approaching winter, may thus enjoy the opportunity with little inconvenience to themselves and with the certainty of their donations being well applied. New-York, Jan. 1833.

## UNIVERSALIST BOOKS.

The following Universalist Books are kept constantly for sale at the Messenger office, 65 1-2 Bowery, N. York.

Christian Messenger, Volume I. bound 2 dolls.  
Murray's Life, with preface and notes, 75 cents.  
Ancient History of Universalism, from the age of the apostles to the Reformation. Price \$1.20.  
Modern History of Universalism, from the Reformation to the present time. Price \$1.20.  
Ballou's Works. Treatise on Atonement, 75 cents.  
Notes on the Parables 75. Sermons on Important Doctrinal Subjects, 37 1-2.  
Notes and Illustrations of the Parables, by Thomas Whittemore. In this work all the New Testament Parables are explained at length. 62 1-2 cents.  
Smith on Divine Government, showing that God fore-ordained human events, and is conducting all things, to produce the Universal Happiness of man. An English work, 75 cents.  
Balfour's Works. First Inquiry, on the words rendered Hell, 1 dollar. Second Inquiry, on the Devil and Satan, and the terms rendered everlasting, forever &c. 1.25. Essays on the Intermediate State, 1.25. Letters to Hudson, in reply to his attack on the Essays, 1.25. Reply to Stuart, 75. Reply to Sabine, 50 cents. Letters to Dr. Allen, 25 cents.  
Petitpierre on Divine Goodness, 50 cents. An excellent work on Universalism, originally published in French.

Pickering's Lectures, in defence of Divine Revelation With a Likeness of the Author. 75 cents.  
Streeters Universalist Hymn Book, different qualities and prices, 60 cents to \$1.75.  
Winchester's Dialogues, a highly useful and instructive work, in which the objections to Universalism, particularly those founded on the words everlasting, forever, &c. are fully and triumphantly answered. 76.

## UNIVERSALIST BOOKS.

Balfour's Works; Ballou's do; Smith on Divine Government; Pickering's Lecture on Revelation; Winchester's Dialogues; Life of Murray; Petitpierre on Divine Goodness; Ancient History of Universalism; Modern Universalism; Universalist-Expositor. For sale by A. C. THOMAS, 132 Chesnut-st. Philad.

## P. PRICE, PRINTER,

Nos. 2 and 3 Marble Buildings, Chatham Square, where JOB PRINTING will be neatly executed, on reasonable terms. Orders solicited.